

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
East Hampshire

January 2000

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to the structure of local government, the boundaries of individual local authority areas, and their electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)
Professor Michael Clarke (Deputy Chairman)
Kru Desai
Peter Brokenshire
Pamela Gordon
Robin Gray
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

We are statutorily required to review periodically the electoral arrangements – such as the number of councillors representing electors in each area and the number and boundaries of wards and electoral divisions – of every principal local authority in England. In broad terms our objective is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, and the number of councillors and ward names. We can also make recommendations for change to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils in the district.

This report sets out the Commission's draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of East Hampshire.

© Crown Copyright 2000

Applications for reproduction should be made to: Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, ©Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>31</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for East Hampshire: Detailed Mapping	<i>33</i>
B East Hampshire District Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements	<i>39</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>41</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Alton, Petersfield and Whitehill is inserted inside the back cover of the report.

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for East Hampshire on 20 July 1999.

- **This report summarises the representations we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in East Hampshire:

- **in 23 of the 31 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and 17 wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2004 electoral equality is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 23 wards and by more than 20 per cent in 16 wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 93-94) are that:

- **East Hampshire District Council should have 44 councillors, two more than at present;**
- **there should be 34 wards, instead of 31 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 29 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of three, and two wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

These draft recommendations seek to ensure that the number of electors represented by each district councillor is as nearly as possible the same, having regard to local circumstances.

- **In 29 of the proposed 34 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **An improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue with the number of electors per councillor in five wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2004.**

Recommendations are also made for changes to parish and town council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- **revised warding arrangements and the re-distribution of councillors for the parishes of Alton, Liss, Petersfield and Rowlands Castle;**
- **revised warding arrangements and an increase in the number of councillors serving Horndean and Whitehill parish councils.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 18 January 2000. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 13 March 2000:

**Review Manager
East Hampshire Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142
E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1	Alton Amery & Whitedown	2	Alton ward (part – Alton North West parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton South West parish ward (part) of Alton parish)	Map 2 and Large map
2	Alton West & Ashdell	2	Alton ward (part – Alton South East parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton South West parish ward (part) of Alton parish)	Map 2 and Large map
3	Alton Wooteys & Manor	2	Alton ward (part – Alton Holybourne parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton North East parish ward (part) of Alton parish); (part – Alton South West parish ward (part) of Alton parish)	Map 2 and Large map
4	Binsted & Bentley	1	Binsted ward (the parish of Binsted); Froyle & Bentley ward (part – the parish of Bentley)	Map 2
5	Bramshott & Liphook	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parish of Bramshott & Liphook)	Map 2
6	Clanfield	2	Clanfield & Buriton ward (part – the parish of Clanfield); Rowlands Castle ward (part – part of Rowlands Castle parish)	Maps 2 and A5
7	East Meon	1	Clanfield & Buriton ward (part – the parish of Buriton); East Meon & Langrish ward (the parishes of East Meon and Langrish)	Map 2
8	Farringdon	1	Alton South West & Beech ward (part – the parish of Beech); Farringdon ward (part – the parishes of Chawton and Farringdon); North Downland ward (part – the parishes of Bentworth and Wield)	Map 2
9	Four Marks & Medstead	2	Four Marks ward (the parish of Four Marks); Medstead ward (the parish of Medstead)	Map 2
10	Froxfield & Steep	1	Froxfield & Steep ward (the parishes of Froxfield and Steep); The Hangers ward (part – the parish of Colemore & Priors Dean); Petersfield St Peters ward (part – the parish of Stroud)	Map 2
11	Headley & Grayshott	3	Headley ward (the parish of Headley); Grayshott ward (the parish of Grayshott)	Map 2
12	Holybourne & Froyle	1	Alton ward (part – Alton Holybourne parish ward (part) of Alton parish); Froyle & Bentley ward (part – the parish of Froyle); North Downland ward (part – the parishes of Lasham and Shalden)	Map 2 and Large map
13	Horndean Catherington & Lovedean	1	Horndean Catherington ward (part – Horndean Catherington parish ward (part) of Horndean parish); Horndean Kings ward (part – Horndean Kings parish ward (part) of Horndean parish)	Maps 2 and A3

Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
14 Hordean Downs	1	Hordean Catherington ward (part – Hordean Catherington parish ward (part) of Hordean parish)	Maps 2 and A3
15 Hordean Hazleton & Blendworth	1	Hordean Hazleton ward (part – Hordean Hazleton parish ward (part) of Hordean parish); Hordean Murray ward (part – Hordean Murray parish ward (part) of Hordean parish)	Maps 2 and A3
16 Hordean Kings	1	Hordean Hazleton ward (part – Hordean Hazleton parish ward (part) of Hordean parish); Hordean Kings ward (part – Hordean Kings parish ward (part) of Hordean parish)	Maps 2 and A4
17 Hordean Murray	1	Hordean Catherington ward (part – Hordean Catherington parish ward (part) of Hordean parish); Hordean Hazleton ward (part – Hordean Hazleton parish ward (part) of Hordean parish); Hordean Murray ward (part – Hordean Murray parish ward (part) of Hordean parish)	Maps 2, A3 and A4
18 Lindford	1	Whitehill Lindford ward (the parish of Whitehill Lindford)	Map 2
19 Liss Forest & Greatham	1	Liss ward (part – part of Liss parish); The Hangers ward (part – the parishes of Greatham and Hawkley)	Maps 2 and A2
20 Liss	2	Liss ward (part – part of Liss parish)	Maps 2 and A2
21 Petersfield Bell Hill	1	Petersfield St Peters ward (part – Petersfield St Peters parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)	Map 2 and Large Map
22 Petersfield Causeway	1	Petersfield Heath ward (part – Petersfield Heath parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish); Petersfield St Peters ward (part – Petersfield St Peters parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)	Map 2 and Large Map
23 Petersfield Heath	1	Petersfield Heath ward (part – Petersfield Heath parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish); Petersfield St Marys ward (part – Petersfield St Marys parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)	Map 2 and Large Map
24 Petersfield St Marys	1	Petersfield St Marys ward (part – part of Petersfield St Marys parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)	Map 2 and Large Map
25 Petersfield Rother	1	Petersfield Heath ward (part – part of Petersfield Heath parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish); Petersfield St Marys ward (part – part of Petersfield St Marys parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)	Map 2 and Large Map

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
26	Petersfield St Peters	1	Petersfield St Marys ward (part – part of Petersfield St Marys parish ward (part of Petersfield parish); Petersfield St Peters ward (part – part of Petersfield St Peters parish ward (part) of Petersfield parish)	Map 2 and Large Map
27	Rowlands Castle	1	Rowlands Castle ward (part – part of Rowlands Castle parish)	Maps 2 and A5
28	Ropley & Tisted	1	Farringdon ward (part – the parishes of East Tisted and Newton Valence); Ropley & West Tisted ward (the parishes of Ropley and West Tisted)	Map 2
29	Selborne	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parishes of Kingsley, Selborne and Worldham)	Map 2
30	Whitehill Chase	1	Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward (part – part of Whitehill parish)	Map 2 and Large Map
31	Whitehill Deadwater	1	Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill ward) (part – part of Whitehill parish)	Map 2 and Large Map
32	Whitehill Hogmoor	1	Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward (part – part of Whitehill parish)	Map 2 and Large Map
33	Whitehill Pinewood	1	Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward (part – part of Whitehill parish)	Map 2 and Large Map
34	Whitehill Walldown	1	Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward (part – part of Whitehill parish)	Map 2 and Large Map

Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.

2 Map 2 and Appendix A, including the large map in the back of the report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for East Hampshire

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Alton Amery & Whitedown	2	3,850	1,925	1	4,038	2,019	0
2	Alton West & Ashdell	2	3,705	1,853	-2	3,895	1,948	-3
3	Alton Wooteys & Manor	2	3,741	1,871	-1	3,926	1,963	-3
4	Binsted & Bentley	1	2,111	2,111	11	2,233	2,233	11
5	Bramshott & Liphook	3	5,864	1,955	3	6,318	2,106	4
6	Clanfield	2	3,670	1,835	-3	3,675	1,838	-9
7	East Meon	1	1,750	1,750	-8	1,838	1,838	-9
8	Farringdon	1	1,857	1,857	-2	2,051	2,051	2
9	Four Marks & Medstead	2	4,159	2,080	10	4,458	2,229	11
10	Froxfield & Steep	1	1,897	1,897	0	1,942	1,942	-4
11	Headley & Grayshott	3	6,104	2,035	7	6,615	2,205	9
12	Holybourne & Froyle	1	2,147	2,147	13	2,282	2,282	13
13	Horndean Catherington & Lovedean	1	1,948	1,948	3	1,926	1,926	-4
14	Horndean Downs	1	2,072	2,072	9	2,048	2,048	2
15	Horndean Hazleton & Blendworth	1	1,902	1,902	0	1,879	1,879	-7
16	Horndean Kings	1	2,150	2,150	13	2,125	2,125	5
17	Horndean Murray	1	1,878	1,878	-1	1,854	1,854	-8
18	Lindford	1	1,764	1,764	-7	2,015	2,015	0
19	Liss Forest & Greatham	1	1,928	1,928	2	1,906	1,906	-5
20	Liss	2	3,913	1,957	3	4,202	2,101	4
21	Petersfield Bell Hill	1	1,815	1,815	-4	1,877	1,877	-7

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
22 Petersfield Causeway	1	1,839	1,839	-3	1,902	1,902	-6
23 Petersfield Heath	1	1,776	1,776	-6	1,843	1,843	-9
24 Petersfield St Marys	1	1,560	1,560	-18	1,823	1,823	-10
25 Petersfield Rother	1	1,773	1,773	-7	1,940	1,940	-4
26 Petersfield St Peters	1	1,770	1,770	-7	1,830	1,830	-9
27 Rowlands Castle	1	2,131	2,131	12	2,182	2,182	8
28 Ropley & Tisted	1	1,773	1,773	-7	1,798	1,798	-11
29 Selborne	1	1,762	1,762	-7	1,782	1,782	-12
30 Whitehill Chase	1	1,821	1,821	-4	2,129	2,129	6
31 Whitehill Deadwater	1	1,788	1,788	-6	2,102	2,102	4
32 Whitehill Hogmoor	1	1,811	1,811	-5	2,129	2,129	6
33 Whitehill Pinewood	1	1,779	1,779	-6	2,087	2,087	4
34 Whitehill Walldown	1	1,740	1,740	-8	2,045	2,045	1
Totals	44	83,548	-	-	88,695	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,899	-	-	2,016	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on East Hampshire District Council's submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of East Hampshire on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the 11 districts in Hampshire and Portsmouth and Southampton city councils as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of East Hampshire. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in January 1976 (Report No. 134). The electoral arrangements of Hampshire County Council were last reviewed in October 1980 (Report No. 397). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

3 In undertaking these reviews we must have regard to:

- (a) the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, ie the need to:
 - (1) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
 - (2) secure effective and convenient local government;
- (b) the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix C).

4 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the District Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also make recommendations on the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the district.

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties*. This sets out our approach to the reviews.

6 In our *Guidance*, we state that we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been prepared locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local interests are normally in a better position to judge what council size and ward configuration are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while allowing proper reflection of the identities and interests of local communities.

7 Second, the broad objective of PERs is then to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the district as a whole. For example, we will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

8 Third, we are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that district but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified: in particular, we do not accept that an increase in a district’s electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a district council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other districts.

9 The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

Stage	Description
One	Submission of proposals to the Commission
Two	The Commission’s analysis and deliberation
Three	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State

10 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. In two-tier areas, it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the district and county councils would hold elections every two years, i.e. in year one half of the district council would be elected, in year two half the county council would be elected, and so on. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral areas in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities.

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1998/99 PER programme, including the Hampshire districts and Portsmouth and Southampton city councils, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State, the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas.

12 Stage One began on 20 July 1999, when we wrote to East Hampshire District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Hampshire County Council, Hampshire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Hampshire Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament and the Members of the European Parliament for the South East Region, and the headquarters of the main

political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 25 October 1999.

13 At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

14 Stage Three began on 18 January 2000 and will end on 13 March 2000. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.**

15 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to move away from them in any areas, and submit final recommendations to the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to make representations to the Secretary of State. It will then be for him to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Secretary of State accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, he will make an order. The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The district of East Hampshire covers an area of some 200 square miles, extending from Alton in the north to Rowlands Castle in the south. It is essentially rural in character, with the main centres of population being Alton, Petersfield, Horndean and Whitehill. More than 80 per cent of the district is countryside, most of which is in active agricultural production. The district is well connected by road and rail; rail links are available to London from Alton and Bentley, and to London and the south coast from Liphook, Liss, Petersfield and Rowlands Castle. The A3/A3M, A339 and A32 roads offer good north-south routes, while the A272 and the A31 cross the district from east to west.

17 The district contains 39 parishes and is entirely parished. Alton town and Petersfield town comprise 15 per cent and 13 per cent of the district's total electorate respectively.

18 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the district average in percentage terms. In the text which follows, this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

19 The electorate of the district is 83,548 (February 1999). The Council presently has 42 members who are elected from 31 wards, 14 of which are relatively urban in Alton, Hordean, Petersfield and Whitehill, and the remainder are predominantly rural. Two of the wards are each represented by three councillors, seven are each represented by two councillors and 22 are single-member wards. The Council is elected together every four years.

20 Since the last electoral review there has been a large increase in the electorate in East Hampshire district, with around 68 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments. The most notable increases have been in Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) and Petersfield St Marys wards, with approximately 55 per cent and 49 per cent more electors respectively than 20 years ago.

21 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,989 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 2,112 by the year 2004 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 24 of the 31 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, 18 wards by more than 20 per cent and 10 wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Horndean Kings ward where the councillor represents 62 per cent more electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in East Hampshire

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Alton Holybourne	1	1,800	1,800	-10	1,833	1,833	-13
2 Alton North East	2	3,122	1,561	-22	3,313	1,657	-22
3 Alton North West	1	2,502	2,502	26	2,542	2,542	20
4 Alton South East	1	1,501	1,501	-25	1,751	1,751	-17
5 Alton South West & Beech	2	3,947	1,973	-1	4,223	2,111	0
6 Binsted	1	1,337	1,337	-33	1,389	1,389	-34
7 Bramshott & Liphook	3	5,864	1,955	-2	6,318	2,106	0
8 Clanfield & Buriton	2	4,101	2,051	3	3,984	1,992	-6
9 East Meon & Langrish	1	1,140	1,140	-43	1,254	1,254	-41
10 Farringdon	1	1,137	1,137	-43	1,278	1,278	-39
11 Four Marks	1	2,570	2,570	29	2,837	2,837	34
12 Froxfield & Steep	1	1,532	1,532	-23	1,561	1,561	-26
13 Froyle & Bentley	1	1,294	1,294	-35	1,337	1,337	-37
14 Grayshott	1	1,888	1,888	-5	2,012	2,012	-5
15 Headley	2	4,216	2,108	6	4,603	2,302	9
16 Horndean Catherington	1	2,959	2,959	49	2,927	2,927	39
17 Horndean Hazleton	1	1,639	1,639	-18	1,720	1,720	-19
18 Horndean Kings	1	3,219	3,219	62	3,200	3,200	52
19 Horndean Murray	1	2,133	2,133	7	2,081	2,081	-1
20 Liss	2	4,803	2,402	21	5,092	2,546	21
21 Medstead	1	1,589	1,589	-20	1,621	1,621	-23
22 North Downland	1	1,114	1,114	-44	1,120	1,120	-47
23 Petersfield Heath	1	2,328	2,328	17	2,325	2,325	10
24 Petersfield St Marys	2	4,402	2,201	11	4,996	2,498	18
25 Petersfield St Peters	2	4,064	2,032	2	4,175	2,088	-1

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
26 Ropley & West Tisted	1	1,430	1,430	-28	1,439	1,439	-32
27 Rowlands Castle	1	2,310	2,310	16	2,361	2,361	12
28 Selborne	1	1,762	1,762	-11	1,780	1,780	-16
29 The Hangers	1	1,142	1,142	-43	1,116	1,116	-47
30 Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill)	3	8,939	2,980	50	10,492	3,497	66
31 Whitehill Lindford	1	1,764	1,764	-11	2,015	2,015	-5
Totals	42	83,548	–	–	88,695	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,989	–	–	2,112	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by East Hampshire District Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1999, electors in North Downland ward were relatively over-represented by 44 per cent, while electors in Horndean Kings ward were relatively under-represented by 62 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

22 At the start of the review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for East Hampshire District Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

23 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers and members from the District Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 14 representations during Stage One, including district-wide schemes from the District Council, the North East Hampshire Conservative Association, the East Hampshire Conservative Association, the East Hampshire Constituency Labour Party and a district councillor, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the District Council and the Commission.

East Hampshire District Council

24 East Hampshire District Council proposed a council size of 44, two more than at present, representing 38 wards, seven more than at present. Its scheme was predominantly based on single-member wards, with four two-member and one three-member ward. It argued that “mainly single-member wards have been suggested because in sparsely populated rural areas multi-member wards would be so large as to lose any sense of community identity”. The District Council further argued that the four Area Community Committees in the district represent distinct areas with the main centres of population within them, and that its proposed scheme “establishes wards within which the existing area-based decision making arrangements can continue”.

25 It proposed that the town of Petersfield be divided into six single-member wards, with an overall increase in one councillor for the area, and that the town of Alton be divided into six single-member wards, retaining the same number of councillors. It further proposed that the relatively urban areas of Whitehill and Horndean each be divided into five single-member wards; Whitehill being allocated one additional councillor and Horndean being allocated two additional councillors. In the more rural areas it proposed creating several new wards based on a reconfiguration of mostly whole parishes, with the only exception being Rowlands Castle and Liss, where it proposed dividing these parishes between two district wards. The Council’s proposals are summarised at Appendix B.

The North East Hampshire and East Hampshire Conservative Associations

26 The North East Hampshire Conservative Association and East Hampshire Conservative Association (called “the Conservative associations” henceforth) put forward identical schemes. They argued that they could not support the proposals put forward by the District Council and that their scheme is “not only closer to the required electoral balance, but also more in keeping with the geographical and social groupings of parishes in this rural district”. However, there were similarities between their scheme and that of the District Council’s, in that it was based on a council size of 44, and generally used whole parishes as building blocks. The main differences from the District Council’s scheme were proposals for the existing Binsted ward and Froyle &

Bentley ward in the north of the district. Neither association put forward specific warding arrangements for the urban areas, but allocated a number of councillors for each urban area, which would reflect the District Council's distribution of councillors.

The East Hampshire Constituency Labour Party

27 The East Hampshire Constituency Labour Party put forward an alternative scheme based on a council size of 42 members representing 15 wards. Specific warding arrangements for the urban areas were not provided, however, it allocated a total number of councillors to each urban area. The scheme used whole parishes as building blocks. The Constituency Labour Party argued that its scheme asserted "that electoral equality can be broadly achieved, and community identity can be acknowledged without the need to fragment parishes".

Parish and Town Councils

28 We received representations direct from eight parish and town councils. Alton Town Council supported the District Council's proposals for Alton to be split into six single-member wards. Beech Parish Council expressed a preference for the parish to be transferred from the current Alton South West & Beech ward to the more rural North Downland ward. East Meon Parish Council stated its preference for no change to the parish or district ward arrangements. Greatham Parish Council highlighted its preference for remaining linked with Hawkley parish for community identity reasons, and argued that the District Council's proposal to link the two parishes with Liss Forest would be acceptable as the parish has some community links with Greatham. Hawkley Parish Council commented on the various proposals put forward by the District Council, consulted on locally during Stage One. The Parish Council proposed that the parishes of Hawkley, East Tisted, Newton Valence and Selborne be placed in a district ward and represented by one councillor.

29 Worldham Parish Council supported the District Council's proposals to put Worldham with the parishes of Selborne and Kingsley, and put forward an alternative configuration of parishes in the north of the district. Petersfield Town Council stated that it had nothing to add to the comments that it had made to the District Council, which it assumed that the District Council had taken on board when formulating its proposals. Whitehill Town Council supported the District Council's proposals that the parish of Whitehill be served by five single-member wards.

Other Representations

30 We received a further two representations from local councillors. Councillor Barron (Alton county division) requested that coterminosity with electoral divisions be maintained, if necessary at the expense of electoral equality. Councillor Rodgers (Clanfield & Buriton ward) submitted a district-wide scheme based on a council size of 44, representing 18 wards. This scheme provided for an alternative configuration of parishes, with some similarities to the District Council's scheme.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

31 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for East Hampshire is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to the statutory criteria set out in the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the interests and identities of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

32 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on assumptions as to changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place within the ensuing five years. We must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken.

33 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which provides for exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

34 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates. We will require particular justification for schemes which result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent and over should arise only in the most exceptional of circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

Electorate Forecasts

35 The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 6 per cent from 83,548 to 88,695 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects most of the growth to be in Whitehill, although a significant amount is also expected in the towns of Alton and Petersfield. The Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the District Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

36 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the District Council’s figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council Size

37 As already explained, the Commission's starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government.

38 East Hampshire District Council presently has 42 members. The District Council proposed a council of 44 members which would serve a general pattern of single-member wards, with some two- and three-member wards. It proposed allocating one extra councillor in Petersfield and in Horndean, and two extra councillors in Whitehill. The District Council argued that 44 councillors provides for better electoral equality, reflects increases in population that have taken place, and the substantial development that is forecast to take place. It also compared itself to neighbouring authorities, arguing that they share similarities in size and distribution of electors and are served by a similar number of councillors.

39 The Conservative associations and District Councillor Rodgers also proposed that East Hampshire be represented by 44 councillors.

40 It should be noted that, as stated in our *Guidance*, the Commission does not accept that increases in an authority's electorate should automatically result in a commensurate increase in the number of councillors being returned, nor that changes should be made to the size of an authority simply to make it more consistent with that of a neighbouring area. We have considered the Constituency Labour Party's scheme for retaining the current council size, but note that this would give slightly higher levels of electoral inequality throughout the district and has not been as widely consulted on as the District Council's proposals. We further note that Horndean, Petersfield and Whitehill are all currently significantly under-represented, and given the general support for an increase of two councillors and the much-improved electoral equality which would be achieved under these schemes, while reflecting local communities, we consider that an increase in council size would facilitate convenient and effective local government in East Hampshire.

41 Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 44 members.

Electoral Arrangements

42 We have carefully considered all the representations received, including the district-wide schemes submitted by the Conservative associations, the Constituency Labour Party and the scheme put forward by District Councillor Rodgers. With the exception of the northern part of the district, we noted the consensus between the District Council's scheme and the Conservative associations scheme. We also noted that there was consensus between the Constituency Labour Party's scheme and the Conservative associations' scheme in the north of the district. All district-wide schemes used whole parishes as building blocks wherever possible and allocated the same number of councillors to each urban area.

43 As stated earlier, Councillor Barron requested that coterminosity with electoral divisions be maintained, if necessary at the expense of electoral equality. This is an issue which has arisen in a number of review areas. It is indicative of the tensions which can arise between the achievement of electoral equality within the individual districts of a county, each of whose electoral arrangements can vary significantly in terms of councillor:elector ratios and ward sizes, and across county council electoral divisions, while also seeking some measure of coterminosity between the two. These tensions are not readily reconciled.

44 In certain cases, it has been put to us that in reviewing district electoral arrangements we should prescribe that ward patterns and sizes should be such that they would be compatible with county council divisions. We do not believe this to be an approach the Commission should take. As a Commission, we rely heavily on local authorities and others to put proposals to us on how the electoral arrangements within their individual areas might be improved. We believe that the interests of local democracy are best served by basing our recommendations on schemes which are generated locally, address the statutory criteria and achieve a high level of electoral equality.

45 Nevertheless, we recognise that coterminosity between county divisions and district wards is capable of being conducive to effective and convenient local government, and we place a high value on its achievement as part of our reviews of county council electoral arrangements.

46 However, we note the significant amount of local support that the District Council's scheme enjoys as a result of its extensive consultation. It also has the general support of the Conservative associations. The District Council's scheme provides for improved levels of electoral equality and although five wards would have a variance of over 10 per cent both now and by 2004, no ward would have a variance of over 13 per cent. We consider that, given the geography and the rural nature of the area such imbalances provide for an appropriate balance between the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

47 In view of the degree of consensus behind large elements of the Council's proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, we have concluded that we should generally base our recommendations on the District Council's scheme, with the exception of the parishes in the north of the district where we have based our draft recommendations on Conservative associations' scheme. We consider that these schemes would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One. However, to improve electoral equality further and having regard to local community identities and interests, we have decided to move away from the District Council's proposals in three areas. Given the levels of electoral equality, we would welcome views at Stage Three on how the electoral equality achieved in our draft recommendations could be improved further, while having regard to local communities. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Clanfield & Buriton, East Meon & Langrish, Horndean Catherington, Horndean Hazleton, Horndean Kings, Horndean Murray and Rowlands Castle wards;
- (b) Petersfield Heath, Petersfield St Marys and Petersfield St Peters wards;
- (c) Froxfield & Steep, Liss and The Hangers wards;
- (d) Farringdon, Four Marks, Medstead, Ropley & West Tisted and Selborne wards;

- (e) Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) and Whitehill Lindford wards;
- (f) Bramshott & Liphook, Grayshott and Headley wards;
- (g) Alton Holybourne, Alton North East, Alton North West, Alton South East, Alton South West & Beech, Binsted, Froyle & Bentley and North Downland wards.

48 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Clanfield & Buriton, East Meon & Langrish, Horndean Catherington, Horndean Hazleton, Horndean Kings, Horndean Murray and Rowlands Castle wards

49 These wards lie in the south of the district. Clanfield & Buriton (comprising the parishes of those names), East Meon & Langrish (comprising the parishes of those names) and Rowlands Castle (comprising only that parish) wards are predominantly rural, with Clanfield & Buriton returning two councillors and East Meon & Langrish and Rowlands Castle each returning one councillor. Under the existing electoral arrangements, the number of electors per councillor is 3 per cent above, 43 per cent below and 16 per cent above the district average respectively (6 per cent below, 41 per cent above and 12 per cent above by 2004). Horndean is relatively urban in comparison to the other wards in the area and is divided between the wards of Horndean Catherington, Horndean Hazleton, Horndean Kings and Horndean Murray, which each return one councillor, with the number of electors per councillor being 49 per cent above, 18 per cent below, 62 per cent above and 7 per cent above the district average respectively (39 per cent above, 19 per cent below, 52 per cent above and 1 per cent below by 2004).

50 The District Council proposed that Rowlands Castle parish be warded between two district wards “to identify the two distinct parts of the parish namely the rural area at the northern part of the parish and the rest of the more built-up southerly part of the parish”. It proposed placing the northern part of the existing Rowlands Castle ward with the parish of Clanfield in a new Clanfield ward, which would then be represented by two councillors. The remainder of Rowlands Castle parish would then form a modified Rowlands Castle ward. In Horndean, the District Council proposed creating an additional ward, dividing the village into five single-member wards, involving an increase in one councillor in the area in order to address the existing under-representation “due to development that has taken place here in recent years”. It proposed that these wards be named Horndean Downs, Horndean Hazleton & Blendworth, Horndean Kings, Horndean Murray and Horndean Catherington & Lovedean. Under these arrangements, the number of electors per councillor would be 9 per cent above, equal to, 13 per cent above, 1 per cent below, and 3 per cent above the district average respectively (2 per cent above, 7 per cent below, 5 per cent above, 8 per cent below and 4 per cent below by 2004).

51 The District Council proposed that the existing East Meon & Langrish ward be modified to include Buriton parish in a new single-member Buriton, East Meon & Langrish ward. It argued that all three parishes comprising this new ward are rural communities with farming being the main activity, and are connected by country lanes. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 8 per cent below the district average (9 per cent below by 2004).

52 The Conservative associations generally supported the District Council's warding arrangements for this area, although they did not submit specific warding arrangements for the Horndean area.

53 We received one other representation regarding this area from East Meon Parish Council who stated its preference for no change to the existing warding arrangements, however this is not viable given the high electoral inequalities that exist.

54 The District Council's proposals would provide for improved electoral equality in the area. We note the continued levels of electoral inequality in the proposed Horndean Kings ward, however due to future development in the area this figure would be greatly improved by 2004. We further concluded that it would be in the interests of community identity to accept a temporary imbalance in the proposed Horndean Kings ward. We therefore propose adopting the District Council's proposals for the area in their entirety. Under our draft recommendations the variances for the Horndean wards would be as stated in the District Council's submission. These proposals are shown on Map 2 and Maps A3, A4 and A5 in Appendix A.

Petersfield Heath, Petersfield St Marys and Petersfield St Peters wards

55 The town of Petersfield is the administrative centre of the district providing a range of shops, employment and services. It comprises the parishes of Petersfield and Stroud. It is divided into three wards, Petersfield Heath ward returning one councillor, Petersfield St Marys ward and Petersfield St Peters ward (currently comprising the parish of Stroud) both returning two councillors each. Under the existing electoral arrangements the area is under-represented, with the number of electors per councillor in Petersfield Heath, Petersfield St Marys and Petersfield St Peters being 17 per cent above, 11 per cent above and 2 per cent above the district average (10 per cent above, 18 per cent above and 1 per cent below by 2004).

56 In order to address the under-representation in the area, the District Council proposed that Petersfield be divided into six single-member wards, an overall increase of one councillor. It proposed a modified Petersfield St Marys ward comprising the north-eastern part of the current ward. The remainder of the southern area of this ward would then join with part of the existing Petersfield Heath ward to comprise a new Petersfield Rother ward. The remainder of this ward, less the area to the east of the stream/drainage channel, would then become a modified Petersfield Heath ward. The remainder of Petersfield Heath ward (to the west of the stream) would then be joined with the southern part of the existing Petersfield St Peters ward to comprise a new Petersfield Causeway ward. Part of the remainder of the existing Petersfield St Peters ward would become a new Petersfield Bell Hill ward, less the parish of Stroud to be included in a new ward with the parishes of Froxfield, Steep and Colemore & Priors Dean. Finally, the District Council proposed that the remainder of the existing Petersfield St Peters ward be joined with the remainder of the existing Petersfield St Marys ward to form a modified Petersfield St Peters ward in the centre of the town.

57 It argued that the proposed boundaries "recognise the separate identities in the town, such as the housing estates, road links and physical features". Under these proposals, the number of electors per councillor in Petersfield Bell Hill, Petersfield St Marys, Petersfield Rother,

Petersfield Heath, Petersfield Causeway and Petersfield St Peters wards would be 4 per cent below, 18 per cent below, 7 per cent below, 6 per cent below, 3 per cent below and 7 per cent below the district average respectively (7 per cent below, 10 per cent below, 4 per cent below, 9 per cent below, 6 per cent below and 9 per cent below in 2004).

58 The Conservative associations did not submit specific warding arrangements for Petersfield, but allocated six councillors to the area.

59 We have carefully considered the District Council's proposed warding for the area and noted that the proposed Petersfield St Marys ward would be over-represented by 18 per cent. We therefore considered alternatives while trying to build on the District Council's scheme in Petersfield. On the proposed council size Petersfield merits 5.5 councillors, hence the slight over-representation under the District Council's proposals. We attempted to re-ward Petersfield with a total of five councillors. However, this would result in significant under-representation, particularly by 2004. We therefore looked at other alternatives based on six councillors for the area. However, we found that any alternative for the area would worsen the electoral equality in the remainder of Petersfield, or result in higher levels of electoral inequality by 2004. We are therefore recommending that the District Council's proposals for Petersfield be adopted as part of our draft recommendations, as they reflect local communities and give improved levels of electoral equality by 2004. We would welcome any alternative suggestions or comments on these proposals at Stage Three. Under our draft recommendations, the electoral variances in the proposed Petersfield wards are the same as those put forward by the District Council. These proposals are shown on the large map at the back of the report.

Froxfield & Steep, Liss and The Hangers wards

60 These three wards lie in the centre of the district. The wards of Froxfield & Steep (comprising the parishes of those names) and The Hangers (comprising the parishes of Colemore & Priors Dean, Greatham and Hawkley) currently return one councillor each, while Liss ward (comprising only that parish) returns two councillors. Under the existing arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Froxfield & Steep, Liss and The Hangers wards is 23 per cent below, 21 per cent above and 43 per cent below the district average respectively (26 per cent below, 21 per cent above and 47 per cent below in 2004).

61 In order to address the over-representation in Froxfield & Steep ward, the District Council proposed that Stroud parish, in the existing Petersfield St Peters ward, and Colemore & Priors Dean parish, in the existing The Hangers ward, be included in a modified Froxfield & Steep ward, to be represented by one councillor. It further proposed that the parish of Liss be divided between two district wards to address the under-representation in the ward, with the Liss Forest area to be included in a ward with the parishes of Hawkley and Greatham and represented by one councillor with the remainder of the existing Liss ward forming a two-member ward. The District Council argued that the two areas of Liss Forest and Liss Village are separate communities. It suggested that these wards be named Colemore & Priors Dean, Froxfield, Steep & Stroud ward, and Liss Forest, Hawkley & Greatham ward and Liss ward. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be equal to, 2 per cent above and 3 per cent above the district average respectively (4 per cent below and 5 per cent below and 4 per cent above by 2004).

62 The Conservative associations put forward identical warding arrangements for the area to those of the District Council.

63 Hawkley Parish Council objected to the District Council's proposals and proposed that the parishes of Hawkley, East Tisted, Newton Valence and Selborne be placed together on the grounds that they share common identities. Greatham Parish Council supported the District Council's proposals, highlighting its preference for remaining linked to Hawkley parish. It stated that "since the construction of the A3 Petersfield by-pass, part of Greatham has been cut off from the rest of the village, and now has close ties with Liss Forest. There is a natural boundary between Liss and Liss Forest and a local gap separating the two".

64 When considering the proposals for the area, we looked at the alternative put forward by Hawkley Parish Council to place the parishes of Hawkley, East Tisted, Newton Valence and Selborne in a district ward. Although this combination of parishes would give good electoral equality in itself, we cannot consider any area in isolation, and such an arrangement would have an adverse effect on the surrounding area. We therefore consider that the District Council's proposals would provide the best levels of electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria, and propose that they be put forward as part of our draft recommendations. However, we propose that the these wards be named Froxfield & Steep ward, Liss Forest & Greatham ward and Liss ward. We would welcome further comments at Stage Three. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be as stated in the District Council's submission. These proposals are shown on Map 2 and Map A2 in Appendix A.

Farringdon, Four Marks, Medstead, Ropley & West Tisted and Selborne wards

65 These five wards lie in the north-west of the district and comprise a number of small rural communities, returning one councillor each. Farringdon ward comprises the parishes of Chawton, East Tisted, Farringdon and Newton Valence; Four Marks and Medstead wards each comprise only the parish of the same name; Ropley & West Tisted ward comprises the parishes of those names; and Selborne ward comprises the parishes of Kingsley, Selborne and Worldham. Under the existing arrangements, the number of electors per councillor is 43 per cent below the district average in Farringdon, 29 per cent above in Four Marks, 20 per cent below in Medstead, 28 per cent below in Ropley & West Tisted and 11 per cent below in Selborne (39 per cent below, 34 per cent above, 23 per cent below, 32 per cent below and 16 per cent below by 2004).

66 The District Council proposed an alternative configuration of parishes in the area in order to address the general over-representation. It proposed that the existing Ropley & West Tisted ward be extended to include the parishes of East Tisted and Newton Valence, currently in Farringdon ward, in a new single-member Ropley, West Tisted, East Tisted & Newton Valence ward. The District Council argued that Ropley and West Tisted are historically linked and that "the addition of the other two parishes would ensure a ward covering areas linked by their rural nature". It also pointed out that the parishes of East Tisted, West Tisted and Newton Valence are linked by the A32 road. Under these proposals, the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent below the district average (11 per cent below by 2004).

67 The District Council further proposed that the existing Four Marks and Medstead wards be amalgamated to comprise a new two-member Medstead & Four Marks ward. It did, however, recognise that the two parishes are quite different “in respect of character and appearance”, but stated that their geographical proximity makes their establishment in a new ward logical. Moreover, the District Council highlighted the fact that the A31 Winchester-Alton road runs between Medstead and Four Marks establishing a link between the two parishes. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 10 per cent above the district average (11 per cent above by 2004). The District Council recommended no change to the existing Selborne ward, which comprises the parishes of Kingsley, Worldham and Selborne. It argued that “Kingsley and Worldham in particular have very strong links with each sharing local services, facilities and community events; both are linked by the B3004”. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent below the district average (12 per cent below by 2004).

68 The Conservative associations put forward identical warding arrangements to the District Council for the area. Worldham Parish Council supported the District Council’s proposals that the parishes of Kingsley, Worldham and Selborne remain in a single district ward.

69 After carefully considering all the evidence available, we concluded that the District Council’s scheme for the area provides an appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria while also enjoying local support. We are therefore putting forward these proposals as part of our draft recommendations. However, we recommend that the proposed Ropley, West Tisted, East Tisted & Newton Valence ward be named Ropley & Tisted as we consider the suggested name over-complex. We welcome comments from interested local parties at Stage Three, particularly with regard to ward names. Under our draft recommendations the electoral variances for the area would be as stated in the District Council’s submission. These proposals are shown on Map 2 in Appendix A

Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) and Whitehill Lindford wards

70 These two wards lie to the east of the district and form the second largest settlement in East Hampshire. Whitehill has experienced some of the highest rates of development in the district over the last 10 years. Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward comprises the parish of Whitehill, while Whitehill Lindford ward comprises the parish of Lindford. Under the existing arrangements the number of electors per councillor in the three-member Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward and the single-member Whitehill Lindford ward is 50 per cent above and 11 per cent below the district average respectively (66 per cent above and 5 per cent below by 2004).

71 The District Council proposed that in order to address the under-representation in the area, and to accommodate proposed future development, the number of councillors be increased from three to five. It proposed that the existing Whitehill (Bordon & Whitehill) ward be split into five single-member wards while Whitehill Lindford ward would remain unchanged. The District Council argued that “Bordon and Whitehill have separate identities and the wards have been created to take account of this”.

72 It proposed that a new Whitehill Hogmoor ward be created, comprising the relatively rural western area of Whitehill. It further proposed that a new Whitehill Pinewood ward be created comprising the remainder of the northern part of the area, bordering Whitehill Lindford ward to the east. A new Whitehill Bordon East ward would cover the area to the south of the existing Whitehill Lindford ward and a new Whitehill Bordon West ward covering the area to the west of the proposed Whitehill Bordon East ward. Finally, it proposed a new Whitehill Walldown ward comprising the remainder of Whitehill in the south of the settlement. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor in Whitehill Bordon East, Whitehill Bordon West, Whitehill Hogmoor, Whitehill Pinewood and Whitehill Walldown would be 6 per cent below, 4 per cent below, 5 per cent below, 6 per cent below and 8 per cent below the district average respectively (4 per cent above, 6 per cent above, 6 per cent above, 4 per cent above and 1 per cent above by 2004).

73 The Conservative associations did not submit specific warding arrangements for the remainder of the area. They did, however, allocate a total of five councillors to Whitehill.

74 Whitehill Town Council supported the District Council's proposals to split Whitehill into five single-member wards. However, it stated that the proposed Whitehill Bordon East ward and Whitehill Bordon wards should be renamed Whitehill Deadwater ward and Whitehill Chase ward respectively, to better reflect the areas covered.

75 We have carefully considered all the evidence available. We consider that an increase in councillors from three to five is justified, due to the existing under-representation and the projected development in the area. We also note that these proposals are supported by the parish council, and provide for substantially improved levels of electoral equality, while having regard to the statutory criteria. We therefore propose putting forward the District Council's proposals for the area, but recommend that the Parish Council's proposals for Whitehill Bordon East ward be named Whitehill Deadwater, and Whitehill Bordon West ward be named Bordon Chase, be put forward as part of our draft recommendations for the area. We would welcome further comments at Stage Three, particularly in relation to ward names. Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor for the area would be as stated in the District Council's submission. These proposals are shown in the large map at the back of the report.

Bramshott & Liphook, Grayshott and Headley wards

76 These three wards lie to the east of the district, with the wards of Headley and Grayshott bordering Surrey. The number of electors per councillor in the three-member Bramshott & Liphook ward (comprising the parish of the same name) is currently 2 per cent below the district average (equal to the average by 2004). In the single-member Grayshott ward (comprising the parish of the same name) this figure is 5 per cent below the district average (5 per cent below by 2004), while in the two-member Headley ward (comprising Headley parish) it is 6 per cent above the district average (9 per cent by 2004).

77 The District Council proposed no change to Bramshott & Liphook ward. It argued that “the area is a distinct community served by its own shops, schools, pubs, restaurants and railway station”. It further argued that although some of the parish is rural in nature, much development has taken place over the last few years with more expected, and therefore proposed that the ward remain unchanged. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the district average (4 per cent above by 2004). The District Council also proposed that the existing Grayshott and Headley wards remain unchanged, arguing that both areas and the surrounding parishes have a distinct identity and that “a grouping or division of parishes would not allow for an area with combined community interests”. Under the District Council’s proposals the number of electors per councillor in Grayshott and Headley wards would be 1 per cent below and 11 per cent above the district average respectively (equal to and 14 per cent above by 2004).

78 The Conservative associations also proposed no change to Bramshott & Liphook, Grayshott and Headley wards.

79 The Constituency Labour Party proposed that Headley and Grayshott wards be combined to create a new three-member ward. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent above the district average (9 per cent by 2004).

80 Given the generally good levels of electoral equality that already exist in the area, we are adopting the District Council’s proposal for Bramshott & Liphook ward to remain unchanged. Under our draft recommendations, the electoral variances for this ward would be as in the District Council’s submission. However, we note that, under the Council’s scheme, Headley ward would be under-represented by 14 per cent by 2004, and, while recognising the distinct identity of both Headley and Grayshott wards, we propose adopting the Constituency Labour Party’s proposals for the area. We therefore propose that both Headley and Grayshott wards be combined to create a new three-member Headley & Grayshott ward. We consider that these proposals would still have regard to both communities while significantly improving electoral equality. Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Headley & Grayshott ward would be 7 per cent above the district average (9 per cent above by 2004). These proposals are shown in Map 2.

Alton Holybourne, Alton North East, Alton North West, Alton South East, Alton South West & Beech, Binsted, Froyle & Bentley and North Downland wards

81 These eight wards cover the northern part of the district. Alton is the largest town in the district and acts as the main focus for services, providing a wide range of community and public facilities. Alton North East and Binsted wards each return two councillors, while the rest of the above wards each return one councillor. Binsted ward comprises the parish of the same name, Froyle & Bentley ward comprises those two parishes, while North Downland ward comprises the parishes of Bentworth, Lasham, Shalden and Wield. The other wards comprise only parts of Alton town, except for Alton South West & Beech which additionally comprises the new parish of Beech. Under the current arrangements the number of electors per councillor in Alton Holybourne, Alton North East, Alton North West, Alton South East, Alton South West & Beech, Binsted, Froyle & Bentley and North Downland wards is 10 per cent below, 22 per cent below,

26 per cent above, 25 per cent below, 1 per cent below, 33 per cent below, 35 per cent below and 44 per cent below the district average respectively (13 per cent below, 22 per cent below, 20 per cent above, 17 per cent below, equal to, 34 per cent below, 37 per cent below and 47 per cent below by 2004).

82 The District Council proposed that the town of Alton be divided into six single-member wards, requiring the re-warding of the parish, so that the number of district councillors representing the town would decrease from seven to six. It argued that “the new wards take account of the housing estates and areas of shared community interest within the town”. It proposed that a new Alton Holybourne & Manor ward be created comprising the existing Alton Holybourne ward plus the whole of Anstey Lane and Wooteys Way, aligning the boundary along the back of the houses in Anstey Lane until it meets Wren Close, continuing along the back of the houses in Wren Close, Plovers Way and Allen Close until it meets London Road. The boundary would then continue westward to include the sports ground, Eggars Close and Adams Way, rejoining the existing boundary at the railway line. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Holybourne & Manor ward would be 9 per cent above the district average (9 per cent above by 2004).

83 The District Council also proposed that the existing Alton North East ward be modified so that it no longer includes part of Anstey Lane, Wooteys Way, Plovers Way and Allen Close (as described above). It proposed that the western boundary of the ward be retained until the point where it meets Spitalfields Road, where it would continue until it meets Nursery Road. The boundary would continue along the centre of Nursery Road until it meets the properties to the rear of Nursery Road. The boundary would then continue eastwards along the back of the houses in London Road, excluding the whole of London Road from the ward. The District Council proposed that this new ward be named Alton Wooteys. Under these proposals, the number of electors per councillor would be 9 per cent above the district average (8 per cent above by 2004).

84 The District Council further proposed a new Alton West & Eastbrooke ward comprising the remainder of the existing Alton North East ward, part of the existing Alton North West ward and part of the existing Alton South East ward. The western boundary of this new ward would run along the back of the houses in Wilsom Road (including Wilsom Close and Waterside) until it meets the railway line. Here it would run along the existing boundary until it meets the footpath, and would include the houses in Mount Pleasant until it meets the existing boundary again. The boundary would continue behind the houses in Westbrooke Road and to the rear of the properties in Lenten Street, until it meets the existing boundary. Under these proposals, the number of electors per councillor would be 9 per cent above the district average (8 per cent by 2004).

85 The District Council proposed that the new parish of Beech, created in 1999, form part of a modified North Downland ward (as discussed below) and that the remainder of the existing Alton South West & Beech ward be divided in two. The remainder of Alton South East ward and part of Alton South West & Beech ward would then form a new Alton Ashdell ward, the western boundary of which would run along Butts Road and then along the railway line. The remainder of Alton South West & Beech ward would then form a new Alton Whitedown ward, the northern boundary of which would follow Lenten Street, excluding Barton End and Whitedown Cottages. Finally in this area, the District Council proposed that a new Alton Amery ward be created,

comprising the remainder of Alton North West ward, with both its eastern and western boundaries remaining the same. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor in Alton Amery and Alton Whitedown wards would be 9 per cent above the district average in both wards (9 per cent above and 10 per cent above respectively by 2004).

86 The District Council proposed that the existing Froyle & Bentley ward be modified to include the parishes of Shalden and Lasham in a single-member Bentley, Froyle, Lasham & Shalden ward. It argued that Bentley and Froyle are historically linked and that all the parishes are small and rural “looking towards Alton, Farnham and possibly Basingstoke for facilities and services”. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent below (10 per cent below by 2004).

87 The District Council further proposed that the parishes of Wield and Bentworth in the existing North Downland ward be joined with the parish of Beech and the parishes of Chawton and Farringdon in the existing Farringdon ward, to create a new single-member Wield, Bentworth, Beech, Chawton & Farringdon ward. It argued that although all these parishes have their own distinct communities there are a number of similarities in their outlook. Finally, the District Council argued that, due to its strong community identity, the existing Binsted ward comprising the parish of the same name, should remain unchanged. Under these proposals, the number of electors per councillor in Bentley, Froyle, Lasham & Shalden ward, Wield, Bentworth, Beech, Chawton & Farringdon ward and Binsted ward would be 6 per cent below, 2 per cent below and 30 per cent below the district average (10 per cent below, 2 per cent above and 31 per cent below by 2004).

88 The Conservative associations put forward alternative arrangements for the area, proposing that the Holybourne area be placed with the parishes of Froyle, Shalden and Lasham in a single-member ward. They further proposed that the remainder of Alton be represented by six councillors but did not give detailed warding. Under their proposals, the number of electors per councillor in a new Holybourne, Froyle, Shalden & Lasham would be approximately 14 per cent above the district average (7 per cent above by 2004). They further proposed that the parishes of Bentley and Binsted also be joined to form a single-member Bentley & Binsted ward, resulting in the number of electors per councillor being 11 per cent above the district average (7 per cent above by 2004).

89 The Constituency Labour Party also proposed that Binsted be placed with Bentley to create a single-member ward. We received a further representation from Beech Parish Council regarding this area, which stated its preference for being included in a more rural ward, such as North Downland.

90 We have carefully considered all the evidence available regarding the area and note that the District Council’s proposed Binsted ward would be significantly over-represented, and that the proposed Alton wards would all be slightly under-represented. We have therefore looked at a number of alternative arrangements for the area. We have concluded that the most suitable alternative arrangement for the area is that put forward by the Conservative associations, and the Constituency Labour Party. We therefore propose placing the parishes of Bentley and Binsted in a new single-member Binsted & Bentley ward, to address the significant over-representation in

Binsted, and placing the Holybourne area with the parishes of Froyle, Shalden and Lasham. While we note the opposition of Alton Town Council in the District Council's consultation to separating the Holybourne area from the remainder of Alton, we consider that placing Holybourne in a new district ward would secure an appropriate level of electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. While we note that further improvements to electoral equality could be made by dividing the Holybourne area between wards, we consider that Holybourne is a small and distinct community, and should therefore be left intact. We therefore propose placing the whole of Holybourne in a new single-member Holybourne & Froyle ward which would also address some of the under-representation in the remainder of Alton, which would then merit six councillors. We recognise that this arrangement is not ideal, however, we have considered every alternative for the area, and have been unable to find an suitable alternative that would provide for a more appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Holybourne & Froyle and Binsted & Bentley wards would be 13 per cent above and 11 per cent above the district average (13 per cent above and 11 per cent above by 2004).

91 In consequence of our proposals to place the Holybourne area in a new Holybourne & Froyle ward, and to improve electoral equality further, we propose that Alton be divided into three two-member wards. Our proposals for this area largely follow the community areas identified by the District Council. We do, however, note the preference for single-member wards in the urban areas and would therefore welcome any further comments or alternative arrangements that provide for similar levels of electoral equality for the area, based on single-member wards, at Stage Three. We propose that these three wards be named Alton Amery & Whitedown, Alton West & Ashdell, Alton Wooteys & Manor. Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent above, 2 per cent below and 1 per cent below the district average respectively (equal to, 3 per cent below and 3 per cent below by 2004). We would welcome all comments on these arrangements or any alternative schemes for the area at Stage Three. Our draft recommendations for the area are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map at the back of the report.

Electoral Cycle

92 At Stage One we received no proposals in relation to the electoral cycle of the district. Accordingly, we make no recommendation for change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

Conclusions

93 Having considered all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review, we propose that:

- (a) there should be an increase in council size from 42 to 44;
- (b) there should be 34 wards, three more than at present;

- (c) the boundaries of 29 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of three wards;
- (d) elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

94 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the District Council's proposals, but propose departing from them in the following areas:

- (a) we propose that the town of Alton be represented by three two-member wards;
- (b) we propose that the Holybourne area of Alton Parish be placed with the parishes of Froyle, Lasham and Shalden in a new single-member Holybourne & Froyle ward;
- (c) we propose that Bentley parish be placed with Binsted ward to form a new single-member Binsted & Bentley ward.

95 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2004.

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	42	44	42	44
Number of wards	31	34	31	34
Average number of electors per councillor	1,989	1,899	2,112	2,016
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	23	5	23	5
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	17	0	16	0

96 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for East Hampshire District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the district average from 23 to five. By 2004 only five wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district.

Draft Recommendation

East Hampshire District Council should comprise 44 councillors serving 34 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. Elections should continue to be held for the whole Council.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

97 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Alton, Horndean, Liss, Petersfield, Rowlands Castle and Whitehill to reflect the proposed district wards.

98 The parish of Alton is currently served by 11 councillors representing five parish wards: Alton Holybourne parish ward returning two councillors, Alton North East parish ward returning three councillors, Alton North West parish ward returning two councillors, Alton South East parish ward returning one parish councillor and Alton South West parish ward returning three parish councillors. As mentioned earlier, we propose creating three district wards covering the main town. In order to facilitate this change, we propose modifying the parish warding

arrangements for the town. We propose that a new Alton Amery & Whitedown parish ward be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning four parish councillors; a new Alton West & Ashdell parish ward be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors; a new Alton Wooteys & Manor parish ward be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors; a new Alton Holybourne parish ward be created comprising that part of the proposed Holybourne & Froyle ward in Alton parish, returning one councillor. As mentioned earlier in the district warding arrangements section, we would welcome further comments and evidence at Stage Three on our proposals for Alton.

Draft Recommendation
Alton Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing four parish wards: Alton Amery & Whitedown (returning four councillors), Alton West & Ashdell (returning three councillors), Alton Wooteys & Manor (returning three parish councillors) and Alton Holybourne (returning one parish councillor). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

99 The parish of Horndean is currently served by 12 councillors representing four parish wards; Horndean Murray returning three parish councillors, Hordean Kings returning three parish councillors, Horndean Catherington returning three parish councillors and Horndean Hazleton returning three parish councillors.

100 After consulting with Horndean Parish Council, the District Council requested an increase in parish councillors from 12 to 15, with three parish councillors representing each parish ward. We therefore propose the following new parishing arrangements to facilitate the proposed district warding arrangements: a new Horndean Catherington & Lovedean parish ward be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three councillors; a new Horndean Downs parish ward be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors; a new Horndean Hazleton & Blendworth parish ward be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors; a new Horndean Kings parish ward to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors; a new Horndean Murray parish ward be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors.

Draft Recommendation

Horndean Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, three more than at present, representing five wards: Horndean Catherington & Lovedean parish ward (returning three councillors), Horndean Down parish ward (returning three parish councillors), Horndean Hazleton & Blendworth parish ward (returning three parish councillors), Horndean Kings parish ward (returning three parish councillors) and Horndean Murray parish ward (returning three parish councillors). The boundaries between the five parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on Map A3 in Appendix A.

101 The parish of Liss is represented by 13 parish councillors and is not warded at present. The District Council proposed that, in order to facilitate the proposals at district level, the parish be divided into two parish wards of Liss and Liss Forest. It proposed that Liss parish ward be represented by 10 parish councillors and Liss Forest parish ward be represented by three parish councillors. We propose adopting the District Council's proposal for this area.

Draft Recommendation

Liss Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Liss parish ward (returning 10 parish councillors) and Liss Forest parish ward (returning three parish councillors). The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

102 The parish of Petersfield is currently represented by 12 parish councillors representing three parish wards: Petersfield St Marys returning five parish councillors; Petersfield Heath returning three parish councillors; and Petersfield St Peters returning four parish councillors.

103 Given our proposals for district warding in the area, we propose Petersfield parish be divided into six new parish wards, each returning two parish councillors. We propose that the new parish wards of Petersfield St Peters, Petersfield Bell Hill, Petersfield St Marys, Petersfield Rother, Petersfield Heath and Petersfield Causeway should be created, each coterminous with the district ward of the same name.

Draft Recommendation

Petersfield Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Petersfield Bell Hill parish ward (returning two parish councillors), Petersfield St Marys parish ward (returning two parish councillors), Petersfield Rother parish ward (returning two parish councillors), Petersfield Heath parish ward (returning two parish councillors), Petersfield Causeway parish ward (returning two parish councillors) and Petersfield St Peters parish ward (returning two parish councillors). The boundaries between the six parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

104 Rowlands Castle Parish Council is currently represented by nine parish councillors and is not warded. The District Council proposed that the area of Rowlands Castle to be placed in a new district ward with the parish of Clanfield be named Idsworth & Finchdean parish ward, to be represented by one parish councillor. We therefore propose creating two new parish wards, Rowlands Castle parish ward to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning eight parish councillors, and Finchdean & Idsworth parish ward to be coterminous with that part of Rowlands Castle parish in the proposed Clanfield district ward, returning one parish councillor

Draft Recommendation

Rowlands Castle Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Rowlands Castle parish ward (returning eight parish councillors) and Finchdean & Idsworth parish ward (returning one parish councillor). The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on Map A4 in Appendix A.

105 Whitehill Parish Council is currently represented by 12 parish councillors representing two parish wards: Whitehill (Deadwater) returning six parish councillors and Whitehill (Whitehill) returning six parish councillors. As stated earlier, we proposed that the Whitehill area be divided into five district wards. In its Stage One submission, the District Council stated that Whitehill Parish Council had requested an increase in parish councillors from 12 to 15, with each ward being represented by three parish councillors. Whitehill Town Council reiterated its preference for these arrangements at Stage One.

106 In order to facilitate the proposed district warding arrangements we propose an increase in parish councillors from 12 to 15 representing five new parish wards. We propose that a new Whitehill Chase parish ward be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors; a revised Whitehill Deadwater parish ward be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors; a new Whitehill Hogmoor parish ward be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors; a new Whitehill Pinewood parish ward be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors, and a new Whitehill Walldown parish ward be created to be coterminous with the district ward of the same name, returning three parish councillors.

Draft Recommendation

Whitehill Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, three more than at present, representing five wards: Whitehill Chase parish ward (returning three parish councillors), Whitehill Deadwater ward (returning three parish councillors), Whitehill Hogmoor parish ward (returning three parish councillors), Whitehill Pinewood parish ward (returning three parish councillors) and Whitehill Walldown parish ward (returning three parish councillors). The boundaries between the five parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

107 We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish and town councils in the district.

Draft Recommendation

For parish and town councils, whole-council elections should continue to take place every four years, on the same cycle as that of the District Council.

108 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for East Hampshire and welcome comments from the District Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names, and parish and town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

Map 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for East Hampshire

5 NEXT STEPS

109 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for East Hampshire. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 13 March 2000. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the District Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

110 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
East Hampshire Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk

111 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.

APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for East Hampshire: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the East Hampshire area.

Map A1 illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the district and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail in Maps A2, A3, A4, A5 and the large map at the back of the report.

Map A2 illustrates the existing and proposed district and parish warding of Liss.

Map A3 illustrates the existing and proposed district and parish warding of Horndean.

Map A4 illustrated the existing and proposed district and parish warding of Horndean.

Map A5 illustrated the proposed warding of Rowlands Castle parish.

The **large map** inserted in the back of the report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Alton, Petersfield and Whitehill.

Map A1: Draft Recommendations for East Hampshire: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Warding of Liss Parish

Map A3: Proposed Warding of Horndean Parish

Map A4: Proposed Warding of Horndean Parish

Map A5: Proposed Warding of Rowlands Castle Parish

APPENDIX B

East Hampshire District Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the District Council only in eight wards, where the Council's proposals were as follows:

Figure B1: East Hampshire District Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Alton Amery	Alton North East ward (part – Alton North East parish ward (part) of Alton parish)
Alton Ashdell	Alton South East ward (part – Alton South East parish ward (part) of Alton parish); Alton South West & Beech parish ward (part – part of Alton South West & Beech parish ward (part) of Alton parish)
Alton Holybourne & Manor	Alton Holybourne ward (the parish ward of Alton Holybourne (part) of Alton parish); Alton North East ward (part – Alton North East parish ward (part) the parish of Alton); Alton South East ward (part – Alton South East parish ward (part) the parish of Alton)
Alton West & Eastbrooke	Alton North East ward (part – Alton North East parish ward (part) the parish of Alton); Alton North West ward (part – Alton North West parish ward (part) the parish of Alton); Alton South East ward (part – Alton South East parish ward (part) the parish of Alton)
Alton Whitedown	Alton North West ward (part – Alton North West parish ward (part) of Alton parish); Alton South West & Beech ward (part – Alton South West & Beech parish ward (part) the parish of Alton)
Alton Wooteys	Alton North East ward (part – Alton North East parish ward (part) of Alton parish)
Binsted	Binsted ward (part – the parish of Binsted)
Bentley, Froyle, Lasham & Shalden	Froyle & Bentley ward (the parishes of Froyle and Bentley); North Downland ward (part – the parishes of Lasham and Shalden)

Figure B2: East Hampshire District Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Alton Amery	1	2,068	2,068	9	2,188	2,188	9
Alton Ashdell	1	2,056	2,056	8	2,190	2,190	9
Alton Holybourne & Manor	1	2,079	2,079	9	2,204	2,204	9
Alton West & Eastbrooke	1	2,069	2,069	9	2,186	2,186	8
Alton Whitedown	1	2,075	2,075	9	2,216	2,216	10
Alton Wooteys	1	2,079	2,079	9	2,185	2,185	8
Binsted	1	1,337	1,337	-30	1,389	1,389	-31
Bentley, Froyle, Lasham & Shalden	1	1,791	1,791	-6	1,816	1,816	-10

Source: Electorate figures are based on East Hampshire District Council's submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

APPENDIX C

The Statutory Provisions

Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission's predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear¹. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas will be included in the Commission's review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

2 Under section 13(5) of the 1992 Act, the Commission is required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State for any changes to the electoral arrangements within the areas of English principal authorities as appear desirable to it, having regard to the need to:

- (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
- (b) secure effective and convenient local government.

3 In reporting to the Secretary of State, the Commission may make recommendations for such changes to electoral arrangements as are specified in section 14(4) of the 1992 Act. In relation to principal authorities, these are:

- the total number of councillors to be elected to the council;
- the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards or divisions);
- the number of councillors to be elected for each electoral area, and the years in which they are to be elected; and
- the name of any electoral area.

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish

¹ The Local Government Boundary Commission did not submit reports on the counties of South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear.

or town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

- (a) the number of councillors;
- (b) the need for parish wards;
- (c) the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- (d) the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- (e) the name of any such ward.

5 In conducting the review, section 27 of the 1992 Act requires the Commission to comply, so far as is practicable, with the rules given in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 for the conduct of electoral reviews.

Local Government Act 1972: Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements

6 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1992, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. For ease of reference, those provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below.

7 In relation to shire districts:

Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the district likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration (by the Secretary of State or the Commission):

- (a) the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the district;
- (b) in a district every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district;
- (c) in a district every parish which is not divided into parish wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district.

8 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (a)–(c) above, regard should be had to:

- (d) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and

(e) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

9 The Schedule provides that, in considering whether a parish should be divided into wards, regard shall be had to whether:

(f) the number or distribution of electors in the parish is such as to make a single election of parish councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and

(g) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented on the parish council.

10 Where it is decided to divide any such parish into parish wards, in considering the size and boundaries of the wards and fixing the number of parish councillors to be elected for each ward, regard shall be had to:

(h) any change in the number or distribution of electors of the parish which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;

(i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and

(j) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

10 Where it is decided not to divide the parish into parish wards, in fixing the number of councillors to be elected for each parish regard shall be had to the number and distribution of electors of the parish and any change which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the fixing of the number of parish councillors.